

Comments on EIS Scoping for LIOWP Project

Submitted by Michael J. D'Amico, PO Box 1803, Massapequa, NY 11758

Acronyms – LIOWP DEIS Scoping

ASMFC - Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

ASMFCA – Atlantic States Marine fisheries Cooperative Act

CZMA – Coastal Zone Management Act

DEIS – Draft Environmental Impact Statement

DOT – Department of Transportation

ELMR – Estuarine Living Marine Resources

EFH – Essential Fish Habitat

EPA – Environmental Protection Agency

ESA – Endangered Species Act

FMP – Fisheries Management Plan

GMFMC – Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council

LIOWP – Long Island Offshore Wind Plant

LISSEr – Long Island South Shore Estuarine Reserve

MAFMC - Mid Atlantic Fisheries Management Council

MBTA – Migratory Bird Treaty Act

MMS – Mineral Management Services

MSFCMA – Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Management Act

NEFMC – New England Fisheries Management Council

NJ DEP – New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act

NHPO – National historic Preservation Officer

NPS – National Park Service

NOS – National Oceanic Service

NY DEC – New York Department of Environmental Conservation

NMFS – National Marine Fisheries Service

OCS – Outer Continental Shelf

SAFMC - South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Officer

UN – United Nations

US ACOE – United States Army Corps of Engineers

USCG – United States Coast Guard

US F&WS – United States Fish & Wildlife Service

August 19, 2006

ATTN: Mr. Doug Slitor, LIOWP Project Manager
C/O: Minerals Management Services
MS 5412
1201 Elmwood Park Blvd.
New Orleans, LA 70123

Re: Comments on EIS Scoping for LIOWP Project

Dear Mr. Slitor,

Please place the following comments into the formal public record.

The purpose of this exercise is to establish parameters for the DEIS under the procedures of NEPA. NEPA is designed to balance the benefits of the proposed project against the foreseeable detriments before issuing or denying a permit. Items that MMS must see to being addressed include – but may not be limited to - conservation; economics; aesthetics; general environmental concerns; wetlands; historic properties; fish & wildlife values; flood hazard; floodplain values; land use; navigation; shoreline erosion and accretion; recreation; water supply & conservation; water quality; energy needs; safety; food and fiber production; mineral needs; consideration of property ownership and in general the needs and welfare of the people.

Aspects to be taken into consideration in developing this from my perspective include – but are not limited to – location; marine archeology; marine traffic; air traffic; fish; birds; bats; insects; marine mammals; zoobenthos; macrophytes; habitat; commercial & recreational fisheries; military uses; power cables; communications; public safety; emergency operations; security; conservation; public health & safety; sediment re-suspension & turbidity; tourism; construction, operation, maintenance & decommissioning; destruction and/or disturbance of seabed; sediment re-suspension; noise & vibrations; thermal loadings; introduction of hard substrate habitats; electromagnetic fields; lighting; oil & chemical spills; physical presence of industrial complex; and costs.

In a lions share of the documents thus far presented to the American public the applicants for the LIOWP have consistently deferred to forth coming analysis in almost every category. It is my sincere hope that MMS will hold the applicants accountable and present in the DEIS a rigorous review that utilizes the best available science and all applicable laws so as to allow a comprehensive evaluation of the potential effects of this proposal on the human environment of not only the regional landscape but of the hemispheric one as well.

1. I am again formally protesting, as I have in the past (Comments for Renewable Offshore Energy-2/06 & PEIS Scoping 5/06 attached), the fast tracking of this process. By expediting the process the risk is being run of having critical issues overlooked or missed or not addressed. An example of this point is the LIOWP application as posted on the MMS web site. Nine categories are marked To Be Determined (Section C: 5-Economic Feasibility of Proposal & Alternatives; 7-Environmental Mitigation; 8-Use of Space; 9-Shore Based Operations; 12-Engineering Specifications; 14-Best Practices Review; 17-Emergency Plan; 18-Critical Operations Curtailment Plan; and 19-Decommissioning Plan). This delay tactic coupled with the fast track is unacceptable. MMS should immediately hold this process in abeyance until all rules, regulations and guidelines are promulgated for offshore renewable energy projects proposed for the outer continental shelf (OCS).

If this fast track is not held in abeyance and is allowed to proceed then it goes without saying that all of the relevant comments of merit – both pro and con – that have been submitted to date are captured and fully addressed in this DEIS process. My formal comments to the US ACOE dated August 11, 2005 are attached and I do wish to see these questions and concerns addressed in this DEIS along with the ones I am submitting now. As one can clearly see by cross referencing the applicants responses to the US ACOE (MMS posted LIOWP application) in December, 2005 with my questions and concerns little has been done to date to address them and MMS should not allow them to be deferred any longer. This DEIS is ‘the forth coming review’.

2. Full NEPA compliance, that includes a full range of alternatives and a cost benefit analysis, that incorporates all economic aspects of this proposal (i.e. commercial and recreational fisheries, maritime trade, tourism, property values, etc.) and not just the benefits or siting of the entire wind plant proposal, is mandatory and expected.

3. MMS is obligated to require the applicants explain in full and clear detail how and why the turbine locations were selected and what avoidance and minimization measures are incorporated into the project design to avoid or reduce fish and wildlife and traditional human use impacts.

4. MMS is obligated to require site specific studies be undertaken to document resources that may be affected by both the inter-array and the transmission cables for all oceanic terminals to the onshore termination.

5. MMS is obligated to require applicants to provide clear justification, through environmental analysis, for their choice of the cable route and to explain why they have not explored other feasible routes such as usage of the Wantagh Causeway, an already existing right-of-way corridor. Applicants have been recorded admitting that the Wantagh Causeway was feasible but provided no analysis as to why they are not using it.

6. The landward portion of the applicant’s proposal shows the preferred cable route running onshore underneath of Clock Boulevard in Massapequa and terminating at the Sterling Substation. This aspect of the cable route also presents issues not yet addressed

and a detailed analysis should be undertaken to determine whether any ethnic, racial or socioeconomic groups are being impacted by this proposal. If any of these aspects are found and shown to be having negative environmental consequences then MMS is obligated to require the incorporation of the Civil Rights Act and all other applicable laws into this NEPA process.

7. It is well documented that the shoreline of southern Long Island is one of the most important along the Atlantic Flyway. Impacts, both horizontal and vertical, by this proposal could be devastating to these native and migratory populations if proper studies are not conducted prior to any issuance of permits to the applicants. As the US F&WS has pointed out on numerous occasions in 2005 the methods currently being used by the applicants are not going to give us the full range of data that is needed to make qualified assessments. For this reason MMS should hold the permit application in abeyance until the applicants erect a jack up barge platform in the proposed area and from it conduct radar surveys for winged creatures passing through this region for three years prior to any start up as called for repeatedly by the US Fish & Wildlife Service. Require specifically that three years of preconstruction studies be completed employing a combination of radar (horizontal and vertical), acoustic, direct field sampling, and visual observation. The remote sensing (radar & acoustic) should be operated continually 365 days of the year, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day in all types of weather conditions.

8. Require that the applicants provide full descriptions of how the applicants intend to avoid avian electrocutions, sea structures serving as perching areas, and lighting schemes for all structures.

9. Require formal consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for all federally listed threatened and endangered species occurring in this region be undertaken and incorporated into the DEIS.

10: Require applicants evaluate the potential effects of the proposed project and provide the results in the DEIS of all significant fish and wildlife habitats found in the area and that applicants provide the results in the DEIS.

11: Require applicants to answer, in full detail, all of the questions and concerns raised by the NMFS, MAFMC, US F&WS, NY DEC, NJ DEP, recreational and commercial fishing industry and the public at large concerning ecological and economic impacts to fisheries resources. This includes all comments and concerns submitted to the US ACOE-NY in 2005.

12: The best available science should be the required baseline for assessment of all of the fish stocks utilizing this region during some part of their lifecycle. This data can be found in the NOS ELMR.

13: The applicant, at minimum, should be consulting all federal, multi-state, and individual states for consistency for all fish species that are captured under designated FMP's. This includes – but is not limited to - the NMFS's, NMFS's Highly Migratory

Species Division, NMFS's Habitat Division, MAFMC, NEFMC, SAFMC, GMFMC, EPA, ASMFC and the State's of NY & NJ.

14: The NMFS has pointed out that EFH has been defined throughout aquatic portions of the defined project area for approximately three dozen federally managed fishery species (pelagic, demersal, relatively sessile and highly migratory). The MAFMC has stated that of the thirteen species they manage eleven species with federal FMP's are in the area of this proposal during some part of their lifecycle. These waters provide important adult, juvenile and nursery areas that cannot be underestimated. To date the applicants have avoided answering many of the concerns and questions posed to them and this must cease. A rigorous investigation of the ecological and economic consequences of the proposed action is necessary and should be mandatory for this NEPA process because it will have adverse effects on EFH. This will not only include the direct impacts but indirect as well.

15: Time of year restrictions should be required for many activities (i.e. jet plowing, monopile driving, etc.) of this proposal. MMS should require the applicants to show their timeframe and plans for this matter in the DEIS and how it relates to every species under federal or state FMP's.

16. Require the applicants to complete a navigation risk assessment of the proposals potential impact on navigational and aviation safety, search and rescue operations, communications, radar, and positioning systems as called for by the USCG.

17. What will be the direct impact of this proposal on the wildlife that utilize this region during some part of their lifecycle? What will be the secondary and cumulative impacts on these species for all the recent past, present, and future foreseeable actions of not just industrial scale oceanic wind plants but all of the proposed projects in these waters and along the coastline. This includes – but is not limited to – future liquid natural gas plants, other types of renewable energy projects (i.e. wave, etc.), dredging operations, mining, oil & gas exploration & extraction, coastal armoring, etc. NEPA requires that all direct, secondary and cumulative impacts of all recent past, present, and future foreseeable actions be included in the assessment. To accomplish this the applicants should be required to use a full ecosystem and multi-ecosystem approach to the task at hand.

With potential offshore wind plants alone it has been pointed out by the US F&WS that there are six other wind plants proposed at offshore sites adjacent to Long Island alone. A review of other proposals from a variety of sources shows wind plants being proposed along the Atlantic seaboard from Massachusetts to Virginia.

If this proposal is to be the poster child for all future oceanic wind plants in the nation then nothing but the highest standards should apply and right now a full ecosystem approach is the only route to take.

It is with this in mind that the very foundation of this exercise should center around MMS requiring the applicants to administer a full ecosystem and multi-ecosystem approach when assessing this matter and incorporating those assessments, in full detail, into the DEIS.

Congress, in 2004, mandated exploration of the ecosystem approach in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico and allocated \$2 million for pilot studies. NMFS's has organized around this approach and in 2005 the NEFMC, MAFMC, SAFMC and GMFMC all held scoping hearings on this matter. These agencies now house this information, which the applicants could be taking advantage of. Also the UN should be consulted as they have been working on ecosystem approaches for many years now.

This approach is also justified from the standpoint of fish & wildlife values and threatened and endangered species in the NEPA process. The direct impact is the projects actual footprint. The secondary is the projects impact on the Northeastern Continental Shelf Ecosystem. The cumulative impact should take into account every defined ecosystem from Tierra del Fuego, Argentina to the Arctic.

Whales, sea turtles, avian and marine species will be impacted either directly or indirectly by this project. Many of these species, such as the North Atlantic Right whale (ESA listed) and bluefish (Federal FMP), migrate along the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to Florida and thus utilize both the Northeast and Southeast Continental Shelf Ecosystems. Red Knot shorebirds (petition pending for ESA listing) migrate through this region in late spring from as far away as Tierra del Fuego and again in mid summer after leaving their nesting grounds in the Arctic. Obviously this 20,000 miles migration encompasses almost the entire Atlantic seaboard portion of the Western Hemisphere and thus calls for an entity like the UN to be consulted.

18. Important coastal zone socioeconomic implications, such as conflicts with traditional use and economic dependency with respect to the siting of this proposal, must be addressed in the DEIS.

19. Only peer reviewed technical literature and ready for staff and public review should be included in the DEIS. Internal industry reports may be included but should not be the basis used in this decision making process. These internal documents should also clarify how the circumstances described in the citation compare with the proposed project.

20. Require the project proponent to address environmental impacts that would accrue in all construction and lay down areas to ensure that sediment contours are restored to their preconstruction elevations and stabilized so they can be expeditiously recolonized.

21. Require a wetland and aquatic bed survey and developed strategy to ensure that existing values and functions of littoral habitats are maintained and have these findings published in the DEIS.

22. Require a detailed analysis of the potential for thermal loading and electromagnetic fields associated with this entire proposal of the adverse effects that would result and an explanation of how they will avoid these impacts.

19. Require a sediment transport model data that forecasts erosional patterns and processes under normal and significant storm events for all seasons.

20. Require a full cumulative impact analysis regarding cultural and natural resources that fully considers the impacts to the viewshed.

21. Require the applicant to provide a full listing of all of the various permits (federal, state, county and local) that they will need in order to proceed. This list should include timeframes and current status of each individual permit action.

22. Require an analysis of credible storm strikes on the integrity of the proposed projects structures.

23. Require that LIPA's 2004 to 2013 Master Energy Plan appear in the DEIS in its entirety.

24. Require the applicants to provide their plans for offshore oil and fuel spill discharges and publish results in DEIS including potential allisons. The application touches on this matter and shows a containment model for an estuarine system but I could not find one showing a master plan for the proposed site. This proposal is to be located in the open ocean directly adjacent to a major shipping lane and tourist area and without some type of master plan the applicants run the risk of not being prepared for a major oil or chemical spill if MMS allows them to bypass this critical matter. This plan should also identify who is accountable in case of such a disaster.

25. At minimum, the State of New Jersey's Coastal Zone Management Office and Department of Environmental Protection must be consulted and kept apprised of all developments by MMS and the applicants. This project will impact New Jersey's ports, shipping traffic, fisheries, tourism, land traffic, and numerous other adjacent issues.

Besides the impacts to New Jersey's coastal zone, the applicants also have stated using the City of Bayonne as a proposed staging and lay down area for this proposal. They have yet provided any further details such as specific location; impacts to New Jersey's waters; traffic on land, sea and air within the State of new Jersey's boundaries; and impacts on existing ports and compatibility with adjacent uses.

For these reasons MMS should require the applicants to present a full detailed account of their proposed actions within New Jersey's jurisdictions and publish this information in the DEIS.

26. DEIS should include a full discussion of how this means of creating electricity will lead to the diminished use of fossil fuels.

27. Require the applicants to assess the likely cost, in terms of psychological stress and potential health care costs, on all residents living within one hour from all impacted beaches that may result from the project's destruction of the viewshed of an internationally known oceanfront state park that people have enjoyed for 60 years.

28. Require that applicants determine the economic costs of potential lost revenues to affected municipal, state, and national parks and adjacent communities over the next thirty years should people reduce the number of visits made to the affected parks and their adjacent communities due to potential visual and auditory pollution in the parks from this facility.

29. Require that applicants assess fully all culturally and economic costs regionally and nation-wide that might result over 30 years from similar projects being located adjacent to both coastal and interior state and national parks, should construction of this facility establish a cultural or legal precedent whereby parklands will no longer be protected from adjacent industrial site.

30. Require applicants to assess any possible effects on beach morphology that might occur along all shorelines within 25 miles of the project due to changes in wave refraction around the facility structures.

31. Is the LIOWP Section C-1.4 of the application supposed to be the applicants Operation & Maintenance Plan? Why is this report here? The 9-page report provided tells us nothing in terms of the LIOWP, LLC master plan for Operations and Maintenance. What is revealing is that, according to the report, we know little about offshore operations in bays, seas and estuaries let alone for oceanic operations. Require the applicants to provide to us their master Operation & Maintenance plan and publish it in the DEIS for our review.

32. In the LIOWP Section C - 1.5 of the application this revised schedule should have included scheduled tasks accomplished. MMS should require that applicants include in the DEIS a schedule that shows the current status of all complete and incomplete tasks. It should also give explanations of each item.

33. What is the purpose of the LIOWP Section C - 1.6.1? What does it have to do with the LIOWP, LLC?

34. The maps provided in the LIOWP are significantly lacking in any major details that are relevant to this exercise. At the public hearings held at the Massapequa High School on July 11, 2006 detailed maps were posted on the walls that should be incorporated into this process and published in the DEIS. These maps are important because they help illustrate how the applicants have sandwiched this project in between the 3-mile limit and the Nantucket-Ambrose shipping lane as well as showing sand burrow areas, water depths, etc. in the proposed area and helps raise more questions and concerns. For example, is the sand burrow site active? Has the US ACOE commented on this item since they are normally the agency charged with permitting this matter? Is this part of the US

ACOE Long Island beach replenishment plan? If so, what is the applicants schedule for construction and how does that relate to the Corps schedule for coastal armoring operations?

Other concerns are raised from the standpoint of the geology of the proposed area since the project will have profound impacts on the submerged landscape. Is the area ridge and swale? Is it flat bottom or hard rock? Does it contain relic shoals or natural channels? Overlaying the direct impacts over the geology will help to better serve the feasibility of specific locations.

35. Biological assays for Contaminants of Concern should be preformed throughout the entire region proposed and results published in the DEIS.

36. What is the anticipated duration of time from start up to decommissioning? This schedule and who is responsible for each phase should be published in the DEIS.

37. The exact materials and manufactures of these materials needs to be identified and published in the DEIS. This is critical especially given the potential for severe storms that occur in this region. If we do not know the exact materials making up this project then how can know at what level of storm severity they will withstand?

38. The LIOWP application to MMS is confusing from the standpoint of where exactly the applicants plan to base their land-based operations. These locations need to be identified and published in the DEIS. This is important for a number of reasons. Ship trips, transportation of materials, methods of transportation, contracts with subcontractors and legalities, etc. are all vital components that need to be addressed especially given that this proposal is adjacent to some of the busiest shipping lanes in the world as well as being highly utilized by both the commercial and recreational fishing industries.

39. If the applicant is receiving any form of public funding and/or subsidies for this proposal then these public resources should be identified in the DEIS along with a complete break out of how these expenditures are to be used.

40. If the applicant is receiving any federal, state, county or local waivers or exemptions of laws or ordinances for this proposal then these waivers and/or exemptions should be published in the DEIS.

41. Full details of how the applicants plan on erecting, maintaining and decommissioning this proposal need to be published in the DEIS. This should include – but not be limited to – types of equipment, man-hours, types of trades people needed, fields of expertise, etc.

42. In the LIOWP application to MMS I could find no detailed lighting plan (i.e. monopiles, helicopter pad, substation, etc.) for this proposal. The applicant should be required by MMS to publish the exact lighting scheme for this entire proposal in the DEIS.

43. Does there exist a possibility that this site could contain ordnances? A full search of past actions should be required of the applicants to assure us that this is a moot point. If it is not a moot point then the proper federal and state authorities need to be called in and see to it that this problem is dealt with accordingly.

44. The applicants, in their documents to date, acknowledge this proposal will have negative impacts to wildlife yet do not establish at what that level. MMS should require the applicants to substantiate, through scientific analysis, what these levels are and publish the results in the DEIS.

45. Who is ultimately held liable for this proposal during its entire lifetime?

46. Regarding access, who will ultimately be the decision maker on who can and cannot access these public waters and lands? Is it MMS? Is it the applicants? Is it Homeland Security? And what are the parameters for justification of denial to access in and around this wind plant?

47. If this proposal becomes a matter of national security than who is the lead authority that would invoke eminent domain over people living along its route or who make their living from these waters and how will they be compensated? Will the American taxpayers be the ones paying for this compensation or will the burden of such actions be on the applicants?

48. The preferred route by the applicants of the transmission cable is across the Great South Bay and passes through the LISSER. Therefore consistency between the proposed project and the LISSER Comprehensive Management Plan needs to be assessed with the detailed results of this assessment published in the DEIS.

49. The applicants have stated that field data ‘...will not be collected for any of the alternative sites...’. This is unacceptable and must not be accepted by MMS. The alternatives analysis is a critical component in this process and because of that field data; engineering and related environmental and cost benefit analysis must be a component of this alternative site comparative analysis. It is incumbent upon MMS to be making the decisions as to what are appropriate costs and benefits and not the applicants when it comes to comparison of alternatives.

50. To date I do not believe that the applicants choice of different locations and which works best has ever been completed with a formal public process. The applicants should not be allowed to only view alternatives from the standpoint of matching this industrial scale project with other alternative sites. The purpose and need is the generation of electricity to meet future demands with 25 percent of that load coming from renewables. An alternatives analysis should incorporate repowering of existing plants as well as looking at other means of renewable energy generation. For example what would be the output if the public resources being allocated toward this project were turned toward

outfitting flattop public buildings with solar panels or if smaller scale projects were more strategically placed that would have less ecological and economic damage?

51. The photo simulations used by the applicants in their application need to include depictions from a beach perspective and should be done with different sun and atmospheric conditions.

52. What is the applicant's schedule for proceeding with remote sensing (including magnetometers), side scan sonar and multi-beam sonar for identifying historic underwater resources? Results, if completed in time, should be published in the DEIS. If not done in time a detailed explanation should be provided to us as to why this has not taken place.

53. Are royalties for use of these public lands applicable to this proposal? If so, a complete description of royalties for use of these public lands must accompany the DEIS that includes to whom the funds will go to and who is paying and scheduling date for payments?

54. There is a lack of information to date on the current use of the proposed area by the commercial and recreational fishing communities. MMS should require the applicants to provide this data and publish the results in the DEIS. This information should also include length of time the proposed area would be closed to these communities during the life span of the project.

55. MMS should require the applicants to present any studies that have been conducted that assess the potential changes to both the marine and avian species concentrations and compositions as a result of this project during its life span. If these studies have not been undertaken then MMS should require the applicants to immediately begin them and publish the results in the DEIS. These studies are important from not only a fish & wildlife value standpoint but also is important from an economic and safety one as well. As has already been referenced this proposed area is both currently and historically a major fishing area and an important component for flying animals along the Atlantic Flyway.

56. Regarding the cable arrays (between monopiles & transmission from off to on shore) little information is provided as to the six-foot depth will be assured and maintained. How will we know if the target depths have been achieved? What is the potential of cables being exposed due to storms? How will these cables be monitored? What techniques will be used to rebury cables from storm scouring or maintenance? How will cable repairs be handled if damaged? Will it be brought above the burial depth to the surface of the ocean floor and looped? If so, will it be left there on the ocean floor if the proper equipment and/or rough weather does not allow the reburying of it in a timely manner and would this cause more scouring of benthic habitat and if so has that been factored in to the equation? How will the USCG and commercial and recreational fishing communities be alerted and who will be doing it? Who will be held accountable if the commercial and recreational fishing industries cannot utilize this area because of such

scenarios? Who will compensate them for lost time and opportunity as well as the other industries (fuel suppliers, wholesalers, restaurants, etc.)? MMS should require the applicants provide this information and publish it in the DEIS.

57. Potential impacts from this proposal on marine and aviation radar must be fully explored and assurances, backed by peer reviewed data, must be presented to us that shows, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the proposed project will not have any adverse impacts. To date we know that British and American military institutions have already expressed concerns regarding this matter and although the application shows the applicants stating that they are in the vicinity of major airports and ports they do not mention the nearness of the aircraft and ships utilizing them as they come and go from these bases. On any given day while standing on Jones Beach, one does not have to look very far to see the jet airplanes and ships, not to mention smaller crafts, that are directly on, above, or adjacent to this proposed area. MMS should require the applicants to provide us with the above referenced materials and if they cannot prove there will be no adverse impacts then this permit should immediately be denied.

58. A potential public safety issue may arise from a syndrome known as the flicker effect that may cause disorientation, dizziness and nausea. This is said to be the result of the reflection of sunlight bouncing off the wind turbine structures. It is my understanding that it can come in two forms. The first is the strobe flicker that happens in the early morning and late evening hours. The second is known as the shadow flicker, which happens during the day. If this concern is of merit then what effect will it have upon the humans and wildlife that are utilizing the area during this event? For example, what impact will it have on the thousands of beachgoers between Jones Beach and Robert Moses State Parks or the vehicle operators along Ocean Parkway? Will avian species abandon utilizing the region because of this impact? Again, if this is a concern of merit then a full literature must be undertaken as well as the NHPO and SHPO, the Federal & State DOT's and all other applicable state and federal agencies be consulted. The results should be published in the DEIS to allow for further discussion if warranted.

59. The proposed region for the LIOWP is a known area for many apex predators. For example, it is known that these sharks are attracted to electromagnetic fields like the inter-array and transmission buried cables or towers complexes being proposed. A rigorous discussion should be required of what the potential impacts of this may have on the region. It seems to me that this would have some on the hunting and foraging activities of these species as well as spatial orientation and it causes me to wonder how that will change the current dynamic of the region. Will it bring in additional predators because of the false electromagnetic signals they are being attracted to? If that happens will it cause the prey species to move out of the region and what if those prey species move closer to shore and these predators follow suit? Will this create a public safety problem for the beachgoers that otherwise would not exist at the level this scenario creates? Concerns for population changes and public safety in this area, that has never seen anything like this proposed project before, should not be discounted or underestimated. MMS should require the applicants to present a their data that assures us that the above referenced scenario is not possible.

60. In addition to my final point of my comments that appear in my letter to the US ACOE (referenced in #1 above) I wish to add the following thoughts. I have been blessed to have been to many of this country's wild areas. Not all of these areas were federally designated wilderness areas but they were still wild nonetheless. Sometimes I went to them because I liked the smell of danger and other times it was for a taste of freedom and other times it was of a spiritual nature. Some areas were pristine and some were not but always I walked away with a feeling of rejuvenation.

I visit, when I am physically able, Jones Beach State Park mainly to take refuge in the un-industrialized horizon and to escape the concrete and steel and noise that I, especially here on Long Island, am surrounded by and constantly bombarded with on a daily basis. It also allows me to fold the landscape and appreciate the diversity of life exchanging its wild energy in the scene before me. There are those that will argue that the jets planes overhead take away that experience but I will argue they do not entirely do so. Do I wish they would go away from my little escape at Jones Beach? Yes. I wished the same thing when I viewed them from atop Aquarius Plateau and from the bottom of Escalante Canyon many-many years ago. But they were fleeting, as are those that I see now.

Coupled with the potential for that lost horizon is my deep concern for the salvation of the wild diversity of life that will be directly and indirectly impacted by this mega-million dollar industrial complex. This land, whose definition I take from the late Aldo Leopold '...everything in, on and above.' has, to my knowledge, never seen anything like this before.

The solace I use to experience came before I learned of this project but that now has been temporarily taken away from me. Now when I go to Jones Beach I cannot help but wonder how the whales and sea turtles will react to a steel forest being erected where there was none before? Or who will keep the body count of the pregnant mother whale who dies slamming into one of these pilings as she races away from predators in the murky waters of the Atlantic? Will the spawning and nursery areas of the Loligo squid and summer flounder be forever altered? Do we know if this where the horseshoe crab populations, those magnificent walking lunchboxes and medical kits, winter? Is it on the edge of the ridges of where the LIOWP is to be sited? How many pelagic birds will these industrial scale-rotating blades chop up when they run in to them as they seek calmer waters away from the oceanic storms? These, to me, are the proverbial deaths by a thousand cuts? And so it goes...

And I wonder would the experience be the same for those that find a similar escape in their houses of worship? Would their experience be diminished if they had to wonder whether the footprint of this project was to be placed directly or indirectly in their mosque, synagogue, temple or church? I think it would.

In a way this is a classic of the genre in a struggle that to me dates back to ancient times when the Yahweh Tribe took the icons and placed them inside of the temples and Emperor Constantine wielded his axes against the sacred forests and thus began mans

dominion mentality over the earth. And today the question is still as alive as ever. Do men and women do have dominion over the earth to do with as they please or are they a part of the whole who recognizes that there is life in everything and it is better to work with the forces of nature as opposed to 'harnessing' them? Back then it was Pagans vs. Christians and today it is billed as anthropocentrism vs. biocentrism.

As a former Master Journeyman Electrician with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and a conservationist I have looked at this proposal every which way I can and I still do not see the justification for it. Questions and concerns go unanswered, the process has been politically fast tracked, green veils with threats of global warming are being waved in my face telling me I have to believe while objectivity for the whole gets thrown out the window.

So what is it that I want? I want all legitimate questions and concerns answered and the laws of the land adhered to. I want politics removed and sound science and common sense replacing it. And I want those of you waving your green flags telling me I've got to believe to stop it. I have known about dust devils crossing the Arctic Tundra since 1989 and polar bear's drowning is not new news as is mountain top removal or dying coral reefs all due to global warming and still work to reverse this trend as best I can. But I am also hard pressed right now to see how this proposal to industrialize a wild area is going to help alleviate any of that when there is little action in energy conservation or smaller scaled renewable projects being undertaken with the same vigor and resources that this one is.

In actuality I now view this proposal as just another growth for the sake of growth-taxpayer subsidized-keep them on the grid teat proposal that will not accomplish what it suppose to do. Actually it may do just the opposite while making everyone feel good thinking something really good did happen.

In conclusion, I again wish to state that it is my sincere hope that MMS will see to it that the best available science and all applicable laws are fully utilized and adhered to in this process. Places like Jones Beach and Aquarius Plateau and Escalante Canyon and others to numerous to list here now have become my churches and because of that I am also calling on MMS to invoke the Freedom of Religion Act to make certain the applicants are not violating my, and perhaps many others, religious experience. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Michael J. D'Amico
P.O., Box 1803
Massapequa, NY 11758

cc: Open Letter